

LD1667

.2

1922

THE CITIZEN, THE STATE AND OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM

ADDRESS

by

ROBERT VON MOSCHZISKER

at

DICKINSON COLLEGE

Carlisle, Pa.

COMMENCEMENT DAY

JUNE 6, 1922

1922



LD 1667
.2
1922

THE CITIZEN, THE STATE, AND OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM

This ancient seat of learning, situated, as it is, in one of the most beautiful parts of Pennsylvania, has a wondrous attraction for me; so, when Dr. Morgan extended an invitation to address you, of course it was accepted. Then I cast about for an interesting topic, and finally decided to treat of the Citizen, the State, and our Economic System,—broad subjects for a comparatively short discourse, but very important to consider at this particular time.

You and I are privileged to live in a marked period of evolution; we are seeing old familiar, geographical, social, political and economic lines changed and changing, probably as never before in the world's history. In the midst of such stirring events, the question naturally arises, What part shall we play? What can we contribute towards solving the problems of the moment and of the immediate future? These thoughts must come to every right-minded man, particularly to those of us who, through opportunity, either afforded or created, have been privileged to drink at the fountain of knowledge, and, therefore, are better equipped than our less fortunate brothers to grapple with the questions of the day.

We cannot all play leading parts, apt to win the plaudits of our fellowmen,—although these roles may be in store for some of you, who will step from this room into the world of endeavor; but every one of us can study to gain an understanding of the problems at hand, and, in our own way, within our own sphere of influence, preach the truth, thus helping to overcome some of the social and economic heresies with which the period is beset. One of the chief of these, I fear, is a prevailing notion that the State must care for, shelter, and

even nourish its members, constantly regulating and guiding their personal and business conduct.

This is not only an erroneous idea, but a most harmful one to the individuals who make up, in the aggregate, that mystical something, which, for want of a better name, is termed "the State."

What is this thing we call the State, and what are its true obligations? The old-fashioned conception of the State pictures a sovereign power, typified by a governing head of some sort, possessed of a divine right to exact service from every subject, and, as a consequence, owing a return of paternal care. This is not a true outline of the general conception today, and surely it presents no correct picture of the American idea. To us, the State is the official machinery of organized society, to formulate and administer the law of the land, for the welfare of all the people.

I use the term "official machinery" advisedly, for the political State is but a part of the mechanism which society must depend upon to keep its wheels moving steadily and with security.

There is also the organized church, which most modern schools of thought dismiss from their calculations with small ceremony; yet the influence of this institution, working its way through many forms of religion, has for centuries past done more to control the individual and collective actions of civilized and semi-civilized men than any other one element. While the church may seem to lack old-time vigor just now, yet it will go on, always a great force, and eventually come into its own,—not to control the political State, for that is an undesirable condition of affairs,—I mean it will establish its own due influence on the life and conduct of the individuals who compose the State, and this will be accomplished through the medium of proper teachings and the general recognition that all law and power emanate from on High. But,

aside from strictly religious considerations, the church—I use the term in its broadest sense—even today has a moral and social influence, which, to my mind, is incalculable, and he who dismisses it lightly, when considering the problems of organized society, makes a grave mistake.

Then there are the powerful forces of business, industry and labor, all of which, of recent years, have shown a progressive tendency toward stronger and more compact organization for self-preservation and government; and, with us in America, if not elsewhere, there is another great influence upon the conduct of men, both individually and en masse,—the mighty body of fraternal and charitable associations existing throughout the land, which is ever on the increase.

Each one of these forces,—and many other comparatively minor ones, of which I cannot now take time to speak,—has its own place and particular function in the workings of modern society. While it may prove expedient, and at times necessary, for the State to exercise some control over such groups, when their activities affect adversely the material or economic life of the people, or threaten the welfare of society as a whole, yet, even then they should be interfered with to an extent only that may prove absolutely necessary, and, as a general rule, their functions ought not to be taken over by the State itself. In my opinion, under ordinary conditions, no regulation of the economic and social life of the people, not actually required, should be indulged in by their government.

I leave out of account times of war, for then many rules for individual conduct must be made and a host of activities controlled that no government should meddle with under normal conditions—democracies instinctively and inevitably become autocracies in times of war; in periods of peace, however, the State ought not to

attempt any general supervision over business or undue restraint of the social life of the people; these powers of control should be exerted only on those rare occasions when the public welfare imperatively demands their exercise.

You may ask, why? First, because each step in the direction of such general supervision is a move toward the reorganization of society along socialistic lines, and this, unless all history fails, is bound to prove anti-democratic. Such a scheme of government naturally leads to an all-regulating overlordship by those in control; for, under the socialist State, society, to regulate its vastly increased public affairs, must have in control men of iron will, "bosses" in the grossest sense of the term, who can brook no independence of thought or action—since man, voluntarily working in combination with his fellowmen, is not competent to govern such an all-powerful and complicated organism as will be found necessary to carry on successfully the political, industrial, business and social affairs of a people. Next, any prolonged attempt at running such an organization, instead of training a great body of officials to the required capacity, will be more apt to have the effect of breeding wholesale corruption, destroying personal ambition among the masses, deadening individual initiative, and moulding all men into a common form. Moreover, unrestrained governmental interference with the business life of a people almost invariably leads to efforts at control of economic laws; and these laws, like the mills of God, grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small all who are so bold as to attempt to turn them from their natural course. In short, when the State undertakes to regulate to an undue extent the relations and conduct of those who compose it, and to take out of the hands of a people the personal management and control of their private property (a dangerous doctrine

which is being widely advocated at this time), it enters upon an experiment which, at man's present stage of development, steps beyond the range of possible accomplishment and is bound to lead to demoralization in industrial life as well as the drying up of individual initiative, thereby bringing poverty and distress to the masses, instead of the contentment and happiness which they seek.

To come back to a controlling thought, already expressed: after all is said and done, the State, like every other human organization, must be conducted by men, and it is impossible to find any great number of men having the physical strength, moral caliber and intellectual capacity required for work such as would be called for by a socialistic reorganization of society; this, to my mind, is enough in itself to forbid the experiment.

Here, in America, until recent years, we have studiously avoided overcrowding the State with duties the performance of which would harass the individual in his private or business pursuits, yet we all know how difficult it has become to get competent public servants to administer our comparatively simple government, particularly for the leading positions, requiring executive ability of a high order. The more duties we crowd upon the State, the greater this difficulty will be; it is quite possible to force it to the breaking point, and then—chaos!

It has been said that the duties of the State are to prevent crime and protect contracts; I should say its chief end is to render possible the substitution of law and order for force and discord. This is the real object for which the State exists, but the fewer laws, to accomplish that purpose, the better for all concerned; and, even in the field of making laws, much should be left to the discretion of the various groups of inhabitants who combine, in particular lines of endeavor, or for other worthy purposes—the supreme power insisting simply that no group shall make laws for its own govern-

ment which are antagonistic to, or inconsistent with, those ordained by the State itself.

The thought just voiced is not new, nor does it denote the radical thing known as syndicalism; for the syndicalists, as I understand their doctrines, would carry the idea of class autonomy to such an extreme as, in effect, to do away with the State. The plan I have in mind prevails with us in Pennsylvania at the present time, to a limited extent; for instance, any organized social unit, such as a beneficial or fraternal order or a general ecclesiastical body, may make its own rules and regulations, setting up its own tribunals to administer them, and, so long as the rules and regulations (which are really laws to those to whom they apply) do not transgress the general laws of the State, our courts will sustain the judgments of these private tribunals, that afford relief and adjust difficulties between such organizations and their members or that relate to other matters properly covered by the laws of the body to which a complaining member belongs. Furthermore, the law of the land requires that the members of such bodies ask relief of their own tribunals before applying to the courts of the State.

As the population of a State increases, and its social problems grow more complicated, there is every reason, to my mind, why the idea of group self-government should be encouraged; I submit the thought, for your consideration, as an antidote to the existing tendency toward over-centralization of regulatory powers in the State itself.

While I believe the present attitude is to expect too much of the State, yet I entirely disagree with those who would bring government to an irreducible, impotent minimum, without character or force; these people are anarchists or near-anarchists. One hesitates to use the term, for the mind immediately associates it with unkempt, dirty men, red flags and bombs, rather than with

the large school of so-called philosophical thinkers, who really believe that mankind would be happier, and the world more at peace, if there were no organized governments or prevailing rules of law. The latter are the respectable, but none the less dangerous, class I have in mind.

No one who has had to do with public life and has seen the minute workings of one important department of government—the administration of law in the courts—as I have for many years, and who knows by actual experience how essential the machinery of the law is, to keep men from one another's throats, can have any real doubt about the absolute necessity for a well organized, properly functioning State.

Of course, in conducting such a State, there are times and conditions which call for and warrant regulatory laws affecting the business and social life of the people; but what I wish to warn against is the attitude of mind that tends toward a system that would make the individual dependent on the government for assistance and guidance in his business life and general course of conduct, instead of self-reliant, as he should be, and has been in the past, so far as our country is concerned. This characteristic self-reliance is a distinguishing mark of the American, so much so that it is rapidly acquired by the intelligent immigrant; it must not be lost by putting upon the State those things which the people, in groups or otherwise, ought to do for themselves.

We constantly hear attacks on our existing economic system, and there is a great propaganda throughout the world to substitute something else in its place, even by revolution if necessary, the most persistent demand being for control of the industrial and business life of the people by the State itself. Social and economic systems change by gradual development, and this is as it should be. In a formative state of society, we had the feudal system,

which grew into the wage system, and, as wealth increased, the present so-called capitalistic system came about. It did not, like Minerva, spring full-armed, out of the head of a mighty, selfish Jove, as some seem to think; on the contrary, it is the result of years of growth and, unless put aside for something else, bids fair to go on, slowly, but surely, forming and reforming in accord with the demands of the period which it is serving.

Under our present economic organization, as soon as one earns enough by personal effort to keep himself and those dependant upon him, and to lay aside a surplus, and this surplus is invested so as to produce or distribute something desired by the people, thereby building up a further surplus, that man is a real capitalist. When this capitalist joins his earnings with those of others, so that the whole is sizeable, and part of the net earnings of this bulk are from time to time reinvested, it gradually becomes sufficient to render possible the marvelous industrial and commercial achievements of the present day.

We see these accomplishments on every hand, in the vast means of production and distribution which meet the material needs and desires of the people; and while many of us prefer the joys of intellectual life, rather than those which come from a business career, yet the industrial activities of the age, by example at least, spur every one on to the top notch of effort, no matter in what field he may be working, and they have a tendency to affect favorably the compensation of those engaged in the professions, sciences and arts; the toilers in these higher fields of endeavor are no longer dependent, as of yore, on governmental support or the kindness of a private patron, but can command a living by their work. Finally, the system offers lavish rewards to the fittest of those employed in business or industry, with a fair chance to others, of ordinary ability, to gain a livelihood or more, according to their worth.

There is one class, however, which, in the rise to wealth and power, we have rather sadly, and very foolishly, overlooked, and that is the devoted and all-important teacher in our schools and colleges,—those who have the grave responsibility of training the coming generation; though, from all I hear, there has been a public awakening on this subject, which is bearing fruit. One cannot too strongly emphasize the dignity of this high calling, and the substantial appreciation which is its due.

There was a time when the ordinary man in the ranks of capitalism did not get his fair share either of the direct monetary returns from the system or of the leisure it afforded to others; but this condition is rapidly disappearing, the masters in command now recognizing, to an ever-growing extent, the rights of those who labor in the ranks to a larger share of the direct and indirect returns of their work, and, in many instances, to a share in the management which produces these returns, as far as the management affects the lives of the workers; this is a move in the right direction, which should be encouraged. Then, again, of recent years, working conditions and, where the employer has control, living conditions, have been vastly improved; at the same time, the hours of labor have steadily diminished.

Profit-sharing, also, is coming into vogue, and I hope, with the new idea of representation in the management, it may prove to be a development that, in the end, will solve those difficulties which we broadly term "labor troubles," the adjustment of which, by any juridical means, has puzzled and is puzzling the minds of our best thinkers. I do not despair but that even this problem may be worked out; at least earnest efforts are being made in that direction, and, when some master mind finds a fair and practical way of constraining obedience to a decree against the employee, other than a forcible attempt to compel him to labor, we shall be on the way to

a proper solution, but not before. Harder questions than those presented by the problem before us have been met and answered in the history of the world; and, in due course of time, should profit-sharing and co-operation in management prove a success, capital and labor may mutually set up their own tribunals, fixing their own penalties to enforce their own decrees, and thus avoid the necessity of judicial adjustments by the State, with all the complexities which that plan presents. Many years, and the trial of many schemes, may be required to bring the suggested programme to success, although in the end the desired result may be achieved so naturally that every one will wonder why it did not materialize sooner. That is the way great things often come to pass—seeming to develop suddenly; but, when this happens, it is usually the result of much prior cogitation by a host of thinkers—generally of a scientific turn of mind—whose ideas, through repeated expression, materially affect those who control the world of action, even though, all the while, the individuals thus influenced may lack conscious appreciation of the fact that impressions are being made upon them. This being true, as it undoubtedly is, each well-ripened thought has real value, when contributed to the solution of momentous problems like those under discussion.

Just at this point, apropos of my remark that some master mind may find a workable method of judicially adjusting labor troubles, let me interject that by “master mind” I did not contemplate one engaged in the activities of industrial or business life; for, proficient as these men are in their own department of labor, most of the serious problems which concern the mass life of the people, be they in the applied arts or in the field of economics, are solved, not by those actively engaged in the production or use of the thing or method discovered, but

by students and thinkers—men in closets, who make the great tools of the world for the practical men to handle.

These closet thinkers, or students, are those previously referred to as men of a scientific turn of mind. It is the practical men, however, who must be depended upon to handle the tools the others produce; and a distinctively good feature of our present system is the natural division of its vast activities into various units, which steadily call forth and educate an army of high grade practical workers, trained to management, thus keeping the standard of efficiency high. In this respect, the plan is much superior to one that would enforce the doctrine of centralization, or nationalization, of industry, the tendency of which, as I have said before, is to diminish the supply of managing talent, and thus lead to demoralization of production and distribution. Incidentally, this tendency should be kept in mind by those in control of American business, so they may see to it that, in making combinations, too great a degree of centralization is not indulged in; but we may assume the mass sense of the people, as expressed by their representatives in government, will always impede any attempts at undue centralization of private property, so long as the existing economic scheme continues. To this extent, I entirely agree that interference by the State is not only justifiable, but also sanctioned by a long line of English precedents.

Of course the system under which we operate has developed, and no doubt will continue to develop, flaws and sources of irritation; but these can be, and are, constantly eliminated or remedied. For instance, when it was found that great monopolies were becoming a menace to the public welfare, legislation met the condition thus created, such as the anti-trust laws, the interstate commerce laws, and the numerous public service commission acts; and, when it was found that the workmen engaged in our vast industrial life, and those dependent upon

them, were not properly cared for in cases of injury or death, workmen's compensation laws were enacted to cope with this condition. We are now engaged, by legislation and otherwise, in an effort to cure the evil of fictitious values so often given stocks and corporate securities. In the field of tariff legislation, it often happens that those advocating protection, instead of seeking to get Congress to consider whether the rates sought are calculated to benefit the country as a whole, which is the true criterion, avowedly ask special benefits for themselves; rates determined on that basis represent a clear abuse of power. This is coming to be understood, and, eventually, no doubt a way will be found to eliminate it.

All of the curative efforts to which I have called attention present proper exercises of the power of the State to meet situations brought about through the operation of our economic system, which, either directly or indirectly, adversely affect the general welfare of the people; and, under our form of government, as it has developed, the right of the State—by virtue of what is known as the police power—to make all changes required for the health, happiness and welfare of the people, is now firmly established.

It looked for a while as though the so-called swollen fortunes of the very rich might develop into a public evil, but the present income and inheritance taxes, with our habit of dividing estates among all the heirs, instead of holding them together in the hands of a favored one, have, I believe, effectively dissipated that danger, and the day of the overrich is rapidly passing, although we still see vulgar displays of recently acquired wealth around us.

I can well understand how many persons, of little means, with no luxury in their lives, are filled with an envy that engenders hatred, when they watch the display of wealth indulged in by some, who have either

legitimately or otherwise gathered in the prizes of capitalism; but, as against this offensive class, who use their fortunes in a purely selfish way, there must be offset the other class of rich persons, who look upon wealth as a trust to be administered for the public; these are the men who build churches, support art galleries, open parks, found libraries, aid music, establish hospitals, encourage research, and substantially recognize good work or noble deeds on the part of others. The wealth in the hands of this large and growing class is rapidly returned to the people in well-administered ways; in fact, in many instances, it is better, more intelligently and less selfishly, administered than it would be by the people themselves, if they had it in their own possession. When we think of the vulgar, objectionable rich, produced by the system, we must also give a thought to the great creators and distributors of wealth like Mr. Westinghouse, Mr. Carnegie and others of their kind, and to the many possessors of small fortunes who live quietly and help their fellowmen wherever they can; but, more particularly, we must remember the vast army of wage earners, who, through the operation of the system, in normal times are kept constantly employed; and, in this connection, we must recognize that most of the wealth of the present day would not exist if it were not for the combination of the brain worker and the brawn worker, who, together, really create wealth out of material resources that otherwise would remain dormant.

In considering the part contributed by the brain worker to the combination just mentioned, and the compensation the leaders in that department retain for themselves, it must be remembered that the nature of men engaged in this kind of constructive work often demand an expensive manner of living, in order to function properly. I am told that the great Mr. Westinghouse, the

working of whose mind gave fortunes to many, and furnished employment at good wages to thousands, asserted repeatedly that, without a private car to travel in, and homes at several points, to make his life perfectly comfortable, it would have been impossible for him to do his best work; which was no doubt so, for he was a true man, and, in his own way, a simple one, but not one to be judged by ordinary standards. Men of Mr. Westinghouse's caliber will always command a very high return from their labors, but my prediction is that, from now on, those at the top will get proportionately less, and those in the ranks proportionately more, from the fund of wealth which they create in common.

These men of genius and those of the normal type constitute the personnel of the industrial and business organization under which we live; together, they have brought the existing system to its present state of success. The question is, Shall they continue to work in combination along established lines, or look for other ways? During the titanic struggle which recently ended, we became accustomed to taking chances—regardless of the future—on all sorts and kinds of changes; this attitude was natural and even essential to those times, for such a state of mind had to prevail or the war could not have been waged successfully. In those days, we “scrapped” material things with a heedless hand, and, almost recklessly, abandoned old ideas to experiment with new ones; now a time has come when we can ill afford to discard anything until it has fully served its purposes, and certainly it cannot be said that our present industrial and business organization has reached that point. In other words, there is no good reason to believe we have come to the point where capitalism can be put aside with advantage; nor that there is in sight a worthy successor to this system—founded on the creation, private ownership and control

of property—with its rich prizes ever in sight, for those who fit themselves to strive for them, and lending, as it does, a constant incentive to personal effort.

We must remember that an appeal to the selfish instincts of man, through substantial rewards to be gained, hard and materialistic as it may sound, is a chief incentive to material accomplishment, and, no matter what the form of government or economic system, the work of production and distribution must be done by the people themselves.

Production, distribution and consumption are the main factors in all industrial schemes; and since it is the people who use the output, the plan which best tends toward large production and efficient distribution, helps each one in his capacity of consumer. This is a consideration of serious moment when we contemplate a departure from our present system, particularly if we think of agreeing to the substitution of a purely centralized one, such as is persistently urged by those who, because of existing defects, most clamor for a change.

It often happens that a comparatively small, but ugly, blemish on the exterior of something of real value so prejudices one that, without deeper consideration, he will unjustifiably condemn and abandon it as a whole; no doubt our system has many such blemishes. Thoughtful educated people ought to endeavor to understand the problems raised by these defects, and to seek proper remedies; but, at the same time, they should discourage all efforts to break down the existing organization of society—the product of the experience of ages—under which we have grown strong, happy and prosperous. What I mean is, we should find ways to remedy such faults as the system has, rather than encourage thoughts that contemplate a radical change in the present methods of conducting our affairs; for, if nothing worse, such a substitution would, of necessity, require us to endure all

the sufferings which are bound to come through experimenting with unknown forces; and that these can be great and unendurable is shown by Russia's experience.

Just at this time most of the thinking, writing and talking on the subject in hand is being done by those who do not believe in our institutions; principally, I believe, because they have not been able to take their place in society as now organized. These people would do no better under any other system. What we need is that those who have read and thought on social and economic subjects, and who have convictions of their own in favor of our kind of government and our general plan of business and industrial life, should speak out and meet the attacks of those who do not believe in them; and we need a more general interest in the affairs of the State by those who, in their individual lives, have shown themselves competent to gather the best fruits of the existing order. By "fruits" I do not mean the accumulation of wealth and power, but rather the achievement of a reasonable degree of worldly prosperity and spiritual contentment.

Some people point to the prevailing business depression as evidence of defects in the existing order; but this is entirely unjust, for all must agree that it is not fair to judge any economic plan by the results obtained under extraordinary conditions, brought about by an unprecedented world upheaval such as we are now passing through. If this is to be the standard, however, then I claim that, considering the adverse conditions, the results obtained by the working of the capitalistic system, here in America, are remarkably satisfactory.

Please do not suppose, from anything I have said, that I believe the sum total of virtue lies in our present political or economic methods; on the contrary, it is my belief that we can gain much by studying all advanced schools of thought, and by borrowing therefrom whenever convinced they present points of merit. This course

has been adopted in New Zealand, and, to a less degree, in Australia, with varying opinions as to its success.

It does not do to "stand pat," since that means an end to all progress; and, when property rights come in actual conflict with human rights, always support the human rights side of the controversy. For instance, if an industrial or business enterprise cannot pay a living wage and succeed, or if such an undertaking requires the use, to a harmful extent, of child or female labor, it had better fail, no matter how much property may be involved; so, if the success of any business venture is likely to prove harmful to the morals or best interests of the people as a whole, the fact that it may serve to create property is not a sufficient saving grace. These principles are now recognized, and matters such as those just mentioned, with others in the same category, are controlled by a course of regulation that has become an established part of our system; this, when kept within due bounds, is an excellent thing,—however, within such limitations official interference must be kept, or, experience shows, it rapidly degenerates into an evil.

It is my conviction that, as a general rule, the regulatory power of the State should be exerted only as a last resort; and, in each instance, when the purpose of its use has been fully served, the assertion of the power should be withdrawn in that particular field, the principle being constantly kept in mind that those who compose our economic, industrial, trade and business life ought to be allowed and encouraged to manage such affairs to the greatest possible extent, their control to be interfered with only when an abuse of power, detrimental to the people as a whole, plainly appears, the function of the State in this respect being solely to serve the public welfare, not either to foster or retard individual development,—that should be left to other agencies.

The thought may have occurred to some of you that, during the course of these remarks, I have intermingled, and, possibly, confused the political and economic systems under which we are working; but, while separate, the two have come to affect each other so intimately that, to a very large extent, they must be considered in common.

You may also think from my address today that I have a rather restricted idea of the State. My conception is, briefly, this: The State is an organization set up by the people to preserve liberty under law, to assist, where necessary, in the control and management of their common affairs, and to serve as a medium by which, in case of threatened or actual danger, their sentiments of loyalty to country may be brought into effective play for the general defense. In passing judgment on this definition, you must not confuse State and Country. One owes it to the government under which he lives to take an interest in public affairs, even to a reasonable participation in so-called practical politics, to endeavor to keep the State on the right track, so far as its laws and institutions are concerned, and to carry on an orderly life under those laws and institutions. Duty to Country is a larger thing: a man's country embraces the national family of which he is a loyal member; it comprehends the land where one lives, or, if away, to which the heart clings with the hope of return; it is home, in the largest sense of that beautifully comprehensive word; it is the place whose traditions one shares, and for which, if need be, he will offer up his fortune or even life itself.

Almost a century and a half of history have shown that, with an American audience, it is not necessary to dwell on the theme of loyalty to country; but the obligation of the State toward the individual, and his duty to it, are matters which the trend of events leads me to think we can consider with profit. My message may be summed

up thus: First, do not look upon the State as a universal doctor; if, either as an individual or as a member of a group, you need an economic stimulant or social remedy, try to cure yourself before rushing to the State for aid; constantly remember that the State is created for the benefit of the whole body of the people, not for the benefit of special individuals, groups or classes. Next, it is every educated person's duty, when he takes his place in the world of action, to give thought to the problems I have mentioned today; he should endeavor to understand, at least in a general way, the governmental institutions and economic systems of the world, past and present, likewise those proposed for the future. Finally, before condemning the institutions and system under which his country has lived and prospered, and committing himself to some experiment never tested in the laboratory of experience—or, when tested, found wanting—he should hesitate long, to assure himself of the right of his course. The economic system which has grown up and taken its present form side by side with our political institutions, sharing with them much common history and tradition, is entitled to an examination of its faults and virtues; and if one is convinced that, on the whole, it is calculated to serve society better than any substitute offered in its place, then it is his duty to stand forth armed with conviction, ready to do battle for his belief. The kind of government we possess has been centuries in the making; its germination was in the England of a period prior to William the Conqueror. This political system has developed and changed, slowly but surely, according to the necessities of the times it was serving, the roots, however, always remaining embedded in liberty and liberalism. We must see that these roots are not plucked up, nor the tree allowed to wither;

equally with this, we must have a care that the branches are pruned, as needs be, so they shall grow in the way most useful to mankind as a whole. Such are the duties that I hope my message may help you to realize.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 020 773 547 4